



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/785,572	02/24/2004	Thomas J. Miller	TMILLR.7C1C1	9867
20995	7590	10/04/2006	EXAMINER	
KNOBBE MARTENS OLSON & BEAR LLP			ALEMU, EPHREM	
2040 MAIN STREET			ART UNIT	
FOURTEENTH FLOOR			PAPER NUMBER	
IRVINE, CA 92614			2821	

DATE MAILED: 10/04/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/785,572	MILLER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ephrem Alemu	2821	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2,4-13 and 15-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2,4-13 and 15-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 15 is objected to because of the following informalities: In claim 15, line 8, change "inducing" with --including-- to correct minor typographical error.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. Claims 4, 12, 19 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted structural cooperative relationships are: (i) the structural relationship between "the at least one pair of oscillating transistors, in connection with a full wave rectifier; a bi-directional diode; and a pair of transistors" for claim 4; and (ii) the structural relationship between "the at least one pair of oscillating transistors, in connection with a full wave rectifier; and a bi-directional diode" for claims 12, 19 and 26.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowen (US 5,943,482 cited by applicant); in view of Moisin (US 6,236,168); and further in view of Baggio (US 5,301,093 cited by applicant).

Art Unit: 2821

5. Claims 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 15, 17, 18,20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bowen (US 5,943,482 cited by applicant); in view of Moisin (US 6,236,168); further in view of Baggio (US 5,301,093 cited by applicant); and further in view of Meredith et al. (US 3,953,768).

Re claims 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 15, 17, 18,20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27 and 28, Bowen discloses a portable fluorescent light (i.e., a portable fluorescent work light) to provide diffused illumination comprising:

a tubular case (“a housing having a handle sized so as to permit a user to grasp the housing and a fluorescent light tube receiving area wherein the handle defines a hollow space”) 8 (Figs. 1, 3, 4 and 5; Col. 3, lines 9-12);

two or more fluorescent lamps (“a first and second fluorescent light assemblies positioned within the light tube receiving area of the housing”) 15 (Fig. 3, Col. 3, lines 34-48);

an electronic ballast circuit 9 positioned beyond the end of the lamps (“within the hollow space of the handle of the housing”) for generating regulated power to start and operate multiple fluorescent lamps (Figs. 1-4; Col. 3, lines 49-53).

Bowen does not disclose the fluorescent lamps being PL fluorescent lamps; and multiple switches coupled to the lamps for controlling the lamps independently.

Baggio teaches the use of PL lamp in a portable lamp (Figs. 2, 3; Col. 2, lines 59-68).

Meredith teaches the use of switches (two-pole electrical switches) for operating fluorescent lamps independently in a portable fluorescent lamp apparatus (Col. 4, lines 53-66).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Bowen’s fluorescent lamps with twin tube PL fluorescent lamps

Art Unit: 2821

as taught by Baggio's and further modify the switch of Bowen's with switches as taught by Meredith's for the purpose of energizing and controlling two or more parallel connected PL fluorescent lamps. Furthermore, providing one two-pole switch would have been an obvious design choice.

Re claim 7, given Bowen's in view of Baggio's further in view of Meredith's lighting device, providing a hook as claimed in claim 7 is well in the skill of an artisan and an obvious design choice (as an example see Carmo (US 5,528,477)).

Re claims 9, 11, 16 and 23, providing multiple pairs of oscillating transistors for each plurality of twin tube PL fluorescent lamps would have been within a skill of an artisan. Furthermore, providing multiple pairs of oscillating transistors for each plurality of twin tube PL fluorescent lamps will increase the manufacturing cost.

Remarks

Regarding claims 4, 12, 19 and 26, the merits of indication of allowable subject matter or applied prior art will not be provided in this office action based on the 112 second paragraph as indicated above in paragraph 2.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ephrem Alemu whose telephone number is (571) 272-1818. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Timothy P Callahan can be reached on (571) 272-1740. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Art Unit: 2821

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

EA
9-30-06



TUYET VO
PRIMARY EXAMINER